**Los Rios Community College District**
**District Academic Senate**
**2017-2018**

DAS President…Gary Aguilar
ARC President…Alisa Shubb
CRC President…Greg Beyrer
FLC President…Paula Haug
SCC President…Gayle Pitman

**District Office**
Main Conference Room
Tuesday, November 19, 2019
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

**Approved Minutes**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gary Aguilar | ARC | District Academic Senate President | X |
| Dan Crump | ARC | District Academic Senate Secretary | X |
| Alisa Shubb | ARC | Academic Senate President | X |
| Janay Lovering | ARC | Academic Senate Vice President | |
| Amy Gaudard | ARC | Academic Senate Secretary | Excused |
| | ARC | Academic Senate Past President | |
| Greg Beyrer | CRC | Academic Senate President | X |
| Scott Crosier | CRC | Academic Senate Vice President | X |
| Teresa Aldredge | CRC | Academic Senate Secretary | X |
| Julie Oliver | CRC | Academic Senate Past-President | X |
| Paula Haug | FLC | Academic Senate President | X |
| Eric Wada | FLC | Academic Senate Vice President | X |
| Francis Fletcher | FLC | Academic Senate Secretary | X |
| Carlos Lopez | FLC | Academic Senate Past President | Excused |
| Gayle Pitman | SCC | Academic Senate President | X |
| Lori Petite | SCC | Academic Senate Vice President | X |
| Sandra Guzman | SCC | Academic Senate Secretary | |
| Troy Myers | SCC | Academic Senate Past President | |
| Dyan Pease | SCC | District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) | X |
| Alice Dieli | ARC | District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) | X |

| Karen Tercho | SCC | District Matriculation & Student Services Committee (DM&SSC) | X |
|---|---|---|---|
| Robert Perrone | | Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT) | |
| Guests: | | | |
| Brandon Muranaka | CRC | Faculty, Math | X |
| Camille Moreno | CRC | Faculty, Math | X |
| Leslie Reeves | ARC | Faculty, Universal Design Coordinator | X |
| Phil Smith | ARC | Faculty, Math | X |

Preliminaries

1. Call to Order---called to order at 3:05pm
2. Introduction of Guests
3. Approval of the Agenda---approved.
4. Approval of Minutes (November 5)---deferred.
5. Public Comment

Information Items

6. November LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting
*Recap of the November Board of Trustees meeting including requested conversation with Board members on the foundation of the working relationship with the Board of Trustees as delineated in Board Policy.*

Aguilar reported on the meeting with the LRCCD Board of Trustees (Trustee Nelson was absent) on collegial consultation and the role of the academic senate in relationship with the Board of Trustees, including references to state laws and regulations (Title 5) in addition to LRCCD policies and regulations. Other attendees included the college academic senate presidents, college presidents, and several district administrators (e.g. King, Nye, Sherry). Shubb proposed that a conversation be conducted on a regular (annual, possibly). In addition, such a conversation and orientation might be appropriate for DAS itself.
Aguilar also reported that Trustee Ruth Scribner has resigned, effective immediately---she has recently married and is moving out of her area of representation). DAS members expressed appreciation for her service on the Board and wish her the best on her future endeavors.
Aguilar also commented on the excellent presentation about Folsom Lake College's Prison Education Program.

Decision Items

7.  None

Discussion Items

8.  Report Back: Proposed Online Degree Paths with Arizona State University (ASU)

*Discussion on Sacramento City College's Resolution Oppose Formal Transfer Partnership with Arizona State University Online. (see Attachment A)*
Aguilar reported that he shared the SCC resolution at the November Board meeting. Aldredge noted that LRCFT will be crafting a resolution regarding ASU Online, with a first reading at the LRCFT executive board meeting tomorrow.
Aguilar---with SCC resolution, is there still a need to have conversations with ASU Online officials at the December Board meeting?

- SCC--- questions have been answered.
- ARC---have a list of questions, anticipating responses at the Board meeting.
- FLC---deferring discussion until responses from ASU Online officials.
- CRC---SCC resolution on the agenda for the upcoming CRC senate meeting.

A Los Rios group (including Torence Powell and Marsha Reske) has been working on a business degree pathway with ARC.
Why has there been no discussion about marketing the CSU online business programs at Channel Islands or East Bay? (as noted in calstateonline.net)
Most of Chancellor King's comments about the SCC resolution seemed to be focused on the one resolved about equity.

---

Action:

Aguilar to ask King the status of ASU Online relationship with Los Rios.
- Does this call for an agreement that needs to be approved by the Board?
- Or is it just a written agreement between the two chancellors (Los Rios and ASU)?
- Or is it just a clarification of articulation agreements (especially for the Business degree).

Why aren't they marketing CSU online business programs at Channel Islands or East Bay? What communication has there been with CSU about online bachelor degrees?

---

9. Report Back: Support for Online Teaching
*Discussion on the Colleges Academic Senate's feedback on the resources required to make online course material accessible, including Sacramento City College's Resolution: Meeting ICT Accessibility Standards (See Attachment B)*

Aguilar reported that Chancellor King noted that the district has every intent to share resources to enable accessibility of courses with online components. He also noted that requests for faculty accessibility coordinators need to be included in the faculty prioritization requests at the colleges. Three-year remediation plan.

King response to SCC resolution---we have every intent to share resources. King sent a detailed email including a mention that if faculty want accessibility help, they need to include it in the faculty prioritization planning.

- We are caught between what is required and what is right.

- How can there be such excitement about online education and not devote resources to accessibility issues?
- What is the bar for faculty to work on accessibility?
- This is also a workload issue, it is all intertwined with union issues.

Pitman noted that one of the resolves in the SCC resolution was a request of DAS to come up recommendation to the Board. In response to a question, it was also noted that we need to determine if this will be a report or a recommendation.

There is support for a DAS taskforce to work on this recommendation/report with membership to include the Distance Education coordinators and those involved with accessibility issues. The process will be for the document to go to the four college senates for comments and then come to the DAS for approval.

> Action:
> Determine charge, goal, membership, deadline of accessibility task force (likely the end of the Spring 2020 semester).

10. Report Back and Follow Up: Los Rios Mathematics Departments Response to the Getting There Document

*Discussion and Follow up on meeting with Vice Chancellor Nye regarding concerns that the "Getting There" report from the Campaign for College Opportunity and the California Acceleration Project may be driving/shaping policy within the district, especially with respect to course offerings.*

Aguilar had a meeting with Deputy Chancellor Nye (co-chair, with Aguilar of the AB 705 implementation team), Associate Vice Chancellor Montgomery (working with the discipline workgroups) and the math chairs---he shared concerns and hope that we are closer than we apart.

Faculty want to be involved in any presentation to the Board, but they are really busy dealing with all the changes brought about by AB 705. There is concern that a report at the February Board meeting could provide an update/progress report on faculty-led changes to curriculum and scheduling, but that it would be too soon to be useful to help with a decision at that time. There is the need to have two semesters (Fall 2019 and Spring 2020) of data to provide a basis for any actions by the Board and it is felt that a presentation at the July or August Board meeting (after data from Spring 2020 has been evaluated) would be more appropriate. A presentation does not need to be made by faculty, but it was emphasized that faculty leadership in the affected disciplines must be involved in the formulation of any report/presentation being made to the Board.

It was emphasized that all of this is a 10+1 issue and that the Board needs to "rely primarily upon the advice and judgement of the academic senate (Title 5, section 53200)" and by inference, the appropriate discipline faculty.

Aguilar noted that this will be agenda item for the next AB 705 implementation workgroup meeting. The charge of the AB 705 implementation workgroup is to act on the recommendations of the discipline groups.

There was a proposal to compose a communication to the Board from DAS AB 705 about the role of faculty in this process and advising that the disciplines be given the opportunity to present a full-years-worth of data to help with decisions.

Comments:
- Feel that we (i.e. discipline faculty) are being micromanaged.
- We already comply with AB 705.
- Math is working "really hard" on all of this.
- Administrator repeatedly stated "we will schedule the classes that students need."
- Would a target or goal be enacted after a look at data in progress?
- Need for vigilance.
- There was a very specific request from a Board member.  This requested presentation does not feel like a routine request from the Board.
- It doesn't matter what is the intent of the Board, it was not communicated clearly and effectively.

CRC---AB 705 implementation for math and English will be a discussion item at the CRC senate meeting this week.

ARC---presentation from math faculty.  Agreement with wish of math to "shape" the offerings---"what students need."

SCC---prior to math faculty coming to last DAS meeting, SCC senate had been discussing a resolution re: AB 705, starting with English.  After hearing from math at DAS meeting, the SCC senate passed a resolution (see Attachment C) to use local data and rely on the recommendations of faculty.  Pitman also referenced resolution adopted at ASCCC Fall Plenary Session---Resolution 9.09 (see Attachment D)

FLC---a lot of concern from English faculty.  They have created a support course, concerns that administrators are not "approving" the course.  Advice is for department chairs to schedule the classes and then wait for administrators not to assign the course.

Reports

11.  Meeting with Chancellor King---lengthy discussion of SCC resolution regarding ASU Online; also discussion on DAS presentation to the Board on collegial consultation and the role of the academic senate.

12.  College Academic Senate Presidents
ARC---faculty prioritization presentations this week.
FLC---working on proposal for faculty on special assignment hiring process.
SCC---first reading on meta majors; started to look at program review structure and process; meeting with president and VPs tomorrow to go over faculty prioritization list.
CRC---completed joint process for faculty prioritization, have a list; discussions on AB 705 at next meeting; report from Clarifying the Pathway chair---is there interest in adding themes to GE pattern?

13.  District Curriculum Coordinating Committee---no report.

14.  District Matriculation & Student Success Committee---no report.

15.  District Educational Technology Committee---no report.

16.  Academic Senate for California Community Colleges---no report.

17.  Los Rios College Federation of Teachers---no report.

Adjourned at 4:55pm.

ATTACHMENT A:

**Resolution: Oppose Formal Transfer Partnership with Arizona State University Online**
(Approved by SCC's Academic Senate on 11/12/2019)
Whereas, the state of California, recognizing that higher education is a key lever for economic growth in California, in 1960 codified in the California Education Code §§ 22500-22705 (also known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act)[1] the creation of a coherent, high-quality public system in California as a single pathway of educational opportunity;

Whereas, the demand for online education is on the rise in California, yet students in the California Community College system have few online transfer options within either the California State University[2] or the University of California systems, causing districts such as the Los Rios Community College District to look for alternative options, such as Arizona State University (ASU) Online, for our students who are interested in online transfer opportunities;

Whereas, ASU Online, while a public institution, has been shifting its business model towards an approach that increasingly bears resemblance to the model used by for-profit higher education institutions[3] in the following ways:
• ASU Online is creating a for-profit venture, backed by an investor who was charged in the 2019 college admissions bribery scandal, that will promote its online programs to large-scale employers[4] ;
• ASU Online has made misstatements on their website such as "ASU partners with the following community colleges in California" and lists all 114 colleges in our system even though formal partnerships (other than course articulation agreements) may not necessarily have been mutually agreed upon[5];
• ASU Online engages in aggressive and manipulative marketing tactics, such as requiring prospective students to share their contact information in order to get meaningful information about the institution, and repeatedly calling prospective students multiple times a day for weeks;
• ASU's Action Lab, in conjunction with the Boston Consulting Group, released a study[6] that contains misleading and sometimes inaccurate statements about the success rates in online courses provided by the institutions in the study, including ASU[7];

Whereas, ASU Online is bound by the laws and policies of the state of Arizona, some of which negatively impact people of color; people who are undocumented; people who are incarcerated, formerly incarcerated, or who have a criminal record; and LGBTQ+ people, among others; and which directly conflict with the values and the social justice mission of the California Community College system;

---

[1] Text of the 1960 Donahoe Act, Amendment to the California State Education Code: Sections 22500-22705: https://oac.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb5b69n9fm&brand=oac4&doc.view=entire_text
[2] Cal State Online: https://www.calstateonline.net/
[3] https://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2017/12/21/569269123/for-profit-and-online-educationwhats-going-on
[4] https://www.chronicle.com/article/Arizona-State-Will-Create-a/245929
[5] https://admission.asu.edu/transfer/gpa/california
[6] https://edplus.asu.edu/sites/default/files/BCG-Making-Digital-Learning-Work-Apr2018%20.pdf
[7] https://www.forbes.com/sites/dereknewton/2018/06/13/dont-buy-the-arizona-state-reporton-digital-learning/#6e7cbd036758
[8] https://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_514HJR.pdf

Whereas, online education as a whole continues to be plagued by significant equity gaps[8] and accessibility issues, both of which need to be addressed in order for students to be successful in online courses at SCC and at a future online transfer institution;

Resolved, that the SCC Academic Senate recognizes the urgent need for online transfer options for our students;

Resolved, that the SCC Academic Senate honors the intent of the California Master Plan for Higher Education/Donahoe Higher Education Act by supporting local and statewide efforts to work with our CSU partners to increase the number of online transfer degree options available to our students;

Resolved, that the SCC Academic Senate recommends that significant improvements to our online infrastructure, including embedding practices that reduce equity gaps in online courses and ensuring accessibility in all online course materials, be made before creating formal online transfer partnerships with any institution; and

Resolved, that while the SCC Academic Senate supports continuing our existing course articulation agreements with ASU-Online, and while we support our students' individual right to choose where they wish to transfer, we are in opposition to forming a formal 2+2 transfer pathway to ASU-Online and marketing such a partnership as Los Rios' signature online transfer pathway, and we are in opposition to actively encouraging the funneling of our student dollars out of California and into a state whose values conflict with the values of the California Community College system.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

ATTACHMENT B:

**Resolution: Meeting ICT Accessibility Standards**
Approved by the Sacramento City College Academic Senate on 11-5-2019

Whereas, in March of 2019, the LRCCD Technology Accessibility Task Force released a series of recommendations[1] guiding the colleges towards meeting the following standards and guidelines related to accessibility of Information and Communication Technology (ICT):
• Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
• Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act;
• Accessibility standards described in the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG), version 2.0, levels A and AA (or the most current approved version);
• Title 5 § for distance education courses offered by the colleges.

Whereas, in Fall 2019, according to a Blackboard Ally analysis[2][3] LRCCD offers 9,028 course sections containing over 760,000 ICT content items, the majority of which require remediation in order to be compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;

Whereas, while faculty can and should bear some responsibility in creating new course content that meets accessibility standards, remediating existing course materials has been documented to be extremely time-intensive[4][5] and presents faculty workload issues not addressed in the LRCFT contract;

Whereas, remediating existing course materials to ensure accessibility requires expertise in fields such as Assistive Technology, Information Technology, and Instructional Design, and unless faculty were hired to teach courses in those disciplines, most LRCCD faculty do not possess these skills;

Whereas, both the LRCCD Technology Accessibility Task Force recommendations and LRCCD Board Policies P-7136 and P-8321 imply that the responsibility of ensuring the accessibility of ICT content rests upon the District and the Colleges, and not solely on individual faculty members;

Resolved, the Academic Senate at Sacramento City College requests that the Los Rios Community Colleges District Academic Senate provide a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the scope of what, given workload and training constraints, faculty can be expected to do to meet accessibility standards and guidelines;

Resolved, the Academic Senate at Sacramento City College strongly urges the LRCCD to provide financial support to hire a team of accessibility support staff, including but not limited to faculty accessibility coordinators, instructional designers at each of the colleges; and information technology specialists who are responsible for handling higher-level ICT accessibility issues; and

Resolved, the Academic Senate at Sacramento City College recommends that the LRCCD significantly increase accessibility training resources for faculty at the colleges.

[1] Los Rios Community College District Information and Communication Technology Accessibility Report, March 11, 2019.
[2] [3]

[4] Huss, John A. and Eastep, Shannon. (2016). Okay, Our Courses Are Online, But Are They ADA Compliant? An Investigation of Faculty Awareness of Accessibility at a Midwestern University.
i.e.: inquiry in education: Vol. 8: Iss. 2, Article 2. Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol8/iss2/2
[5] Farr, Beverly, Studier, Carol, Sipes, Laurel, and Coombs, Norman. (2008).
A Needs Assessment of the Accessibility of Distance Education in the California Community
College System. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED537847.pdf

•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••

ATTACHMENT C:

**Resolution: Honoring Collegial Consultation Processes in AB 705 Implementation**
 (Approved by SCC's Academic Senate on 11/12/2019)

Whereas, the Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD) has established an AB 705 Workgroup as well as discipline-specific AB 705 workgroups for Math, English, and ESL all of which are faculty-driven and have been tasked with engaging in AB 705 implementation efforts;

Whereas, per LRCCD Board Policy 3412, section 2.7 states "[c]urriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines" and "standards or policies regarding student preparation and success" are academic and professional matters in which the LRCCD Board of Trustees has to "rely primarily" on the District Academic Senate for advice and recommendations;

Whereas, AB 705 implementation involves curriculum development, establishing or removing prerequisites, and developing standards for student placement into Mathematics. English writing, and ESL courses, all of which are academic and professional matters per Title 5 § 53200, and which legally obligate the LRCCD Board of Trustees to rely primarily on the LRCCD District Academic Senate for advice and recommendations;

Whereas, SCC faculty involved in AB 705 implementation are equity-driven, professionally informed, have first-hand knowledge of the needs of our students, and possess a thorough, experiential knowledge base regarding effective modes of acceleration, and therefore should be entrusted to make good decisions on behalf of our students;

Resolved, that the SCC Academic Senate urges the LRCCD Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology, the Office of Institutional Research, and college-level Institutional Research offices to share AB 705 enrollment and success data, both in aggregated form as well as disaggregated by race/ethnicity and by college, with the AB 705 workgroups;

Resolved, that the SCC Academic Senate requests that the AB 705 workgroups use the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, as well as data from each college's respective Institutional Research offices, to provide a recommendation and rationale regarding effective placement models and course sequences to the District Academic Senate; and

Resolved, that the SCC Academic Senate requests that the District Academic Senate provide a formal recommendation regarding effective placement models and course sequences to the LRCCD Board of Trustees, and that the LRCCD Board of Trustees honor the district's collegial consultation policies by relying primarily on the District Academic Senate for these academic and professional matters.

---

ATTACHMENT D:

Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for All Students Through AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) Implementation
Fall 2019 **Resolution Number:** 09.09

Whereas, The mission of California Community Colleges specifically includes providing remedial education for those in need of it (Education Code Section 66010.4);

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) explicitly refers to students who seek a goal other than transfer and who are in certificate or degree programs with specific requirements that are not met with transfer-level coursework, and stipulates that a community college district or college maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete the required college-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe (Education Code Section 78213);

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) implementation does not require the elimination of developmental or pre-transfer courses that could provide access and foundational skills to many underprepared students, yet in response to the legislation many colleges have eliminated all or most of their credit developmental mathematics, English, and basic skills courses, which could deny access and impede success for many students seeking to obtain a higher education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind all stakeholders that the mission of California Community Colleges and the intent of AB 705 is to serve all students, including those who seek a goal other than transfer and those who may benefit from developmental coursework;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates work with their Chief Instructional Officers to ensure that sufficient developmental, remedial, pretransfer, and/or basic skills courses continue to be offered in order to ensure access and opportunity for success for all students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community College Chancellor's Office provide further guidance and clarification to colleges in order to ensure that AB 705 is implemented accurately and in accordance with their mission, so that all students have access to a community college education regardless of their educational goals or level of preparation.

MSC